Limit Theorems in Mallows Distance for Processes with Gibssian Dependence

L. Cioletti
Departamento de Matemática - UnB
70910-900, Brasília, Brazil
cioletti@mat.unb.br

C. C. Y. Dorea
Departamento de Matemática - UnB
70910-900, Brasília, Brazil
c.c.y.dorea@mat.unb.br

R. Vila
Departamentos de Matemática e Estatística - UnB
70910-900, Brasília, Brazil
rovig161@mat.unb.br

arXiv:1701.03747v1 [math.PR] 13 Jan 2017

Abstract

In this paper, we explore the connection between convergence in distribution and Mallows distance in the context of positively associated random variables. Our results extend some known invariance principles for sequences with FKG property. Applications for processes with Gibbssian dependence structures are included.

1 Introduction

Positive association for a random vector $(X_1, X_2, \cdots, X_n)$ requires that

$$\operatorname{cov}\big(g(X_1, \cdots, X_n), h(X_1, \cdots, X_n)\big) \geqslant 0, \tag{1}$$

whenever g and h are two real-valued coordinatewise nondecreasing functions and whenever the covariance exists. This dependence structure has been widely used in the studies of reliability theory, see Barlow and Proschan [2]. The basic concept actually appeared in Harris [15] in the context of percolation models and it was subsequently generalized to a large class of Statistical Mechanics models in the seminal work by Fortuin, Kasteleyn and Ginibre [11]; in the Statistical Mechanics literature this notion was developed independently from reliability theory, variables are said to satisfy the FKG inequality if they are associated (see, e.g., [11, 18]). In fact, we say a process $\boldsymbol{X} \equiv \{X_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ satisfies the FKG property if (1) holds for any finite subvector $(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}, \cdots, X_{i_n})$.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: 60B10, 60F05, 60G10, 60K35.
Keywords: Mallows Distance; Positive Association; Gibbs Measures.

We will make use of the Mallows distance to analyse the asymptotic behavior of positively associated processes. Mallows distance $d_r(F,G)$, also known as Wasserstein or Kantorovich distance, measures the discrepancy betweem two (cumulative) distribution function (d.f.) F and G. The upper Frèchet bound $H(x,y) = F(x) \wedge G(y)$ illustrates its connection with positive associativity. Let $X \stackrel{d}{=} F$ and $Y \stackrel{d}{=} G$, being $\stackrel{d}{=}$ equality in distribution. Then from the classical Hoeffding's formula we have,

$$\operatorname{cov}(X,Y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \big(H(x,y) - F(x)G(y)\big)dxdy.$$

On the other hand, the representation theorem from Dorea and Ferreira [7] allow us to write,

$$d_r(F,G) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x-y|^r dH(x,y), \quad \text{if } r \geqslant 1.$$

Besides an extensive applications to a wide variety of fields, this metric has been successfully used to derive Central Limit Theorem (CLT) type results for heavy-tailed stable distributions (see, e.g., Johnson and Samworth [17] or Dorea and Oliveira [8]). A key property to achieve these results is provided by its close relation to convergence in distribution ($\stackrel{d}{\to}$), as established by Bickel and Freedman [3],

$$d_r(F_n,G) \nrightarrow 0 \;\Leftrightarrow\; F_n \stackrel{d}{\to} G \text{ and } \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x|^r dF_n(x) \nrightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x|^r dG(x). \tag{2}$$

For stabilized partial sum of positively associated random variables (r.v.'s) we will show convergence in Mallows distance and hence the asymptotic normality. Theorems 4 and 5 generalize Newman and Wright's [22] CLT for stationary processes. By making use of asymptotic normality we strengthen to Mallows d_r convergence. As for the non-stationary case, our Theorem 6 extends Cox and Grimmett's [6] results. Its proof is conceptually different from the Cox and Grimmett's proof and, in particular, we shall mention that the characteristic functions does not play a prominent role in our proof.

As application we exhibit the d_r convergence for ferromagnetic Ising type models with discrete and continuous spins. The results apply to both short and long-range potentials and also to non-translation invariant systems. For finite range potentials the convergence in the Mallows distance of stabilized sums are obtained for any $r \geq 2$. To prove similar results for long-range potentials, near to the critical temperature seems to be a very challenging problem. Here we are able to show that the convergence in the Mallows distance still occurs but some strong restrictions on the order r have to be placed.

2 Positive Association and Mallows Distance

Let $\mathbb{Z}$ be the set of integers. We will be considering processes $\boldsymbol{X} \equiv \{X_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ defined on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and that are positively associated.

Definition 1. *A process* $\boldsymbol{X}$ *is said to be positive associated if, given two coordinatewise non-decreasing functions* $f, g : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ *and* $j_1, \cdots, j_n \in \mathbb{Z}$*, we have*

$$\operatorname{cov}\big(f(X_{j_1}, \ldots, X_{j_n}), g(X_{j_1}, \ldots, X_{j_n})\big) \geqslant 0,$$

provided the covariance exists.

We say that a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is non-decreasing if $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \leqslant f(y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ whenever $x_j \leqslant y_j$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$. For the sake of notation, if a different probability measure μ is to be associated with the measurable space $(\Omega, \mathscr{F})$ we shall write cov_μ and similarly $\mathbb{E}_\mu$ for the expectation. Below we gather few properties needed for our proofs, see Newman and Wright [22] or Oliveira [23].

Lemma 1. *Let* $\boldsymbol{X}$ *be positive associated.*

(a) For $m_j \geq 1$*, if* $f_j : \mathbb{R}^{m_j} \to \mathbb{R}$ *are coordinatewise non-decreasing functions then* $\{f_j(X_{i_1}, \cdots, X_{i_{m_j}}) : i_1, \cdots, i_{m_j} \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ *is also positive associated.*

(b) If all X_j*'s possess finite second moment then the characteristic functions* $\phi_j(r_j) = \mathbb{E}(\exp\{ir_jX_j\})$ *and* $\phi(r_1, \cdots, r_n) = \mathbb{E}(\exp\{i\sum_{j=1}^{n} r_jX_j\})$ *satisfy,*

$$\left|\phi(r_1, \cdots, r_n) - \prod_{j=1}^{n} \phi_j(r_j)\right| \leqslant \frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \leqslant j \neq k \leqslant n} |r_jr_k| \operatorname{cov}(X_j, X_k).$$

Definition 2. *(Mallows [20]) For* $r > 0$*, the Mallows* r*-distance between d.f.'s* F *and* G *is given by*

$$d_r(F, G) = \inf_{(X,Y)} \big\{\mathbb{E}(|X - Y|^r)\big\}^{1/r}, \quad X \stackrel{d}{=} F,\ Y \stackrel{d}{=} G \tag{3}$$

where the infimum is taken over all random vectors (X, Y) *with marginal distributions* F *and* G*, respectively.*

For $r \geq 1$ the Mallows distance represents a metric on the space of d.f.'s and bears a close connection with weak convergence given by (2). Let

$$\mathcal{L}_r = \big\{F :\ F \text{ a d.f. }, \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x|^r\, dF(x) < +\infty\big\}.$$

Theorem 1. *(Bickel and Freedman [3]) Let* $r \geqslant 1$ *and let the d.f.'s* G *and* $\{F_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ *in* $\mathcal{L}_r$*. Then* $d_r(F_n, F) \stackrel{n}{\to} 0$ *if and only if* (2) *holds or equivalently, for every bounded continuous function* $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ *we have,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} g(x)\, dF_n(x) \stackrel{n}{\to} \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(x)\, dG(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x|^r\, dF_n(x) \stackrel{n}{\to} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x|^r\, dG(x).$$

Assume $X \stackrel{d}{=} F$, $Y \stackrel{d}{=} G$ and $(X, Y) \stackrel{d}{=} H$, where $H(x, y) = F(x) \wedge G(y)$. Then the following representation result will be helpful to evaluate $d_r(F, G)$.

Theorem 2. *(Dorea and Ferreira [7]) For $r \geqslant 1$ we have*

$$d_r^r(F,G) = \mathbb{E}\big\{|F^{-1}(U) - G^{-1}(U)|^r\big\} = \int_0^1 |F^{-1}(u) - G^{-1}(u)|^r du$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_H\big\{|X-Y|^r\big\} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x-y|^r dH(x,y),$$

where U is uniformly distributed on the interval $(0,1)$ and

$$F^{-1}(u) = \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} : F(x) \geqslant u\}, \quad 0 < u < 1,$$

denote the generalized inverse.

3 Asymptotics for Positive Associated and Stationary Sequences

Let $\boldsymbol{X} \equiv \{X_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be a stationary sequence in the sense that for all $m \geqslant 1$ and $l \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$(X_{i_1}, \cdots, X_{i_m}) \stackrel{d}{=} (X_{i_1+l}, \cdots, X_{i_m+l}).$$

For stochastic process $\boldsymbol{X}$ it is natural, when dealing with limit theorems, to consider blocks of n consecutive variables,

$$S_n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} X_j \quad \text{and} \quad S_{[k,k+n)} = \sum_{j=k}^{k+n-1} X_j.$$

Clearly, under stationary assumption we have $S_{[k,k+n)} \stackrel{d}{=} S_n$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Our first result follows from Newman's CLT:

Theorem 3. *(Newman [21]) Let $\boldsymbol{X}$ be a stationary and positive associated process. Assume that the variance is finite and strictly positive, $0 < \mathrm{var} X_1 < +\infty$, and that*

$$\sigma^2 \equiv \mathrm{var}(X_1) + 2\sum_{j \geqslant 2} \mathrm{cov}(X_1, X_j) < +\infty. \tag{4}$$

Then

$$\frac{S_{[k,k+n)} - n\mathbb{E}(X_1)}{\sqrt{n}\sigma} \xrightarrow{d} \mathrm{N}(0,1), \quad \forall\, k \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{5}$$

It is worth mentioning that the positive associativity and stationarity assures that

$$\sigma^2 = \chi \equiv \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathrm{cov}(X_k, X_j)$$

is well-defined and the latter is known as the susceptibility associated to $\boldsymbol{X}$.

Define

$$V_{[k,k+n)} = \frac{S_{[k,k+n)} - n\mathbb{E}(X_1)}{\sqrt{n}\sigma} \stackrel{d}{=} F_{[k,k+n)} \tag{6}$$

and let Φ be the d.f. of $\mathrm{N}(0,1)$.

Theorem 4. *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 3 we have for* $0 < r \leqslant 2$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} d_r(F_{[k,k+n)}, \Phi) = 0.$$

Proof. First, note that by stationarity we have

$$\mathrm{var}(S_{[k,k+n)}) = \mathrm{var}(S_n) = n\mathrm{var}(X_1) + 2(n-1)\sum_{j=2}^{n} \mathrm{cov}(X_1, X_j).$$

From (4) it follows that $\dfrac{\mathrm{var}(S_{[k,k+n)})}{n} \stackrel{}{\underset{n}{\to}} \sigma^2$. Thus

$$\mathbb{E}(V^2_{[k,k+n)}) = \mathbb{E}\big\{\big(\frac{S_{[k,k+n)} - n\mathbb{E}(X_1)}{\sqrt{n}\sigma}\big)^2\big\} \stackrel{}{\underset{n}{\to}} 1 = \mathbb{E}(Z^2), \tag{7}$$

where $Z \stackrel{d}{=} \Phi$. Clearly $V_{[k,k+n)} \in \mathcal{L}_2$. Since the convergence (5) holds we conclude from Theorem 1 that $d_2(F_{[k,k+n)}, \Phi) \stackrel{}{\underset{n}{\to}} 0$.

Next, to extend the convergence for $0 < r < 2$ we make use of the representation Theorem 2. There exists a r.v. $Z^* \stackrel{d}{=} \Phi$ such that the joint distribution of $(V_{[k,k+n)}, Z^*)$ is given by $H(x,y) = F_{[k,k+n)}(x) \wedge \Phi(y)$ and

$$d_2^2(F_{[k,k+n)}, \Phi) = \mathbb{E}\big\{(V_{[k,k+n)} - Z^*)^2\big\} \stackrel{}{\underset{n}{\to}} 0.$$

By (3) and the Liapounov's inequality we have for $0 < r \leqslant 2$

$$d_r^r(F_{[k,k+n)}, \Phi) \leqslant \mathbb{E}\big\{|V_{[k,k+n)} - Z^*|^r\big\} \stackrel{}{\underset{n}{\to}} 0.$$

□

To derive convergence for higher order d_r, further moment conditions on X_j's will be required. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ let $u_k(\cdot)$ denote the Cox-Grimmet coefficient defined by

$$u_k(n) = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}:|k-j|\geqslant n} \mathrm{cov}(X_k, X_j), \quad n \geqslant 0. \tag{8}$$

Since we are assuming stationarity we may take $u(n) = u_k(n) = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}:|j|\geqslant n} \mathrm{cov}(X_0, X_j)$. Note that, by Lemma 1 the process $\{X_j - \mathbb{E}(X_j) : j \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is also stationary and positive associated. This allow us to state a moment inequality from Birkel [5] adapted for our needs.

Lemma 2. *Let $2 < r < r^*$ and let $\boldsymbol{X}$ be a stationary and positive associated process. Assume that $\mathbb{E}\{|X_1|^{r^*}\} < +\infty$ and that for some constants $C_1 > 0$ and $\theta \geqslant \dfrac{r^*(r-2)}{2(r^*-r)}$ we have $u(n) \leqslant C_1 n^{-\theta}$. Then there exist a constant $C_2 = C_2(r, r^*)$ such that*

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{E}\big\{|S_{[k,k+n)} - n\mathbb{E}(X_1)|^r\big\} \leqslant C_2 n^{r/2}. \tag{9}$$

Note that, under Theorem 4, we have the above conditions satisfied for $r = 2$. Indeed, by (4) we have $u(n) \leqslant C_1$ and (9) follows from (7).

Theorem 5. *Let $2 < r < r^*$ and assume that $\boldsymbol{X}$ satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 2 with $\theta > \dfrac{r^*(r-2)}{2(r^*-r)}$. Then if σ^2, given by (4), is such that $0 < \sigma^2 < +\infty$ we have*

$$d_r(F_{[k,k+n)}, \Phi) \overset{n}{\to} 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathbb{E}(|V_{[k,k+n)}|^r) \overset{n}{\to} \mathbb{E}(|Z|^r),$$

where $F_{[k,k+n)}$ and $V_{[k,k+n)}$ are defined by (6) and $Z \overset{d}{=} \Phi \overset{d}{=} \mathrm{N}(0,1)$.

Proof. (i) Since $r^* > 2$, by Theorem 3 we have $V_{[k,k+n)} \xrightarrow{d} Z$. Next, we show that

$$V_{[k,k+n)} \in \mathcal{L}_r \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}\{|V_{[k,k+n)}|^r\} \overset{n}{\to} \mathbb{E}\{|Z|^r\}. \tag{10}$$

Then $d_r(F_{[k,k+n)}, \Phi) \overset{n}{\to} 0$ follows immediately from (2).

(ii) For (10) we will show that $\sup_{n\geqslant 1}\sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{E}(|V_{[k,k+n)}|^{r'}) < +\infty$ for some $r < r' < r^*$. Thus $V_{[k,k+n)} \in \mathcal{L}_{r'} \subset \mathcal{L}_r$ and the convergence of moments follows from the fact that $\{|V_{[k,k+n)}|^r\}_{n\geqslant 1}$ is uniformly integrable (cf. Billingsley [4], Theorem 5.4).

Now let $\psi(r) = \dfrac{r^*(r-2)}{2(r^*-r)}$. Then $\psi'(\cdot) > 0$ for $r > 2$. It follows that there exist $r' > r$ such that $\theta > \psi(r')$. Just take $r' = \dfrac{2r^*(1+\theta)}{2\theta + r^*}$. From Lemma 2 we have for $C_2 = C_2(r', r^*) > 0$,

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{E}\big\{|V_{[k,k+n)}|^{r'}\big\} \leqslant C_2 n^{r'/2}.$$

It follows that,

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{E}\Big\{\frac{|V_{[k,k+n)}|^{r'}}{(\sqrt{n}\sigma)^{r'}}\Big\} \leqslant C_2 \frac{n^{r'/2}}{(\sqrt{n}\sigma)^{r'}} = \frac{C_2}{\sigma^{r'}} < +\infty.$$

□

4 The Non-Stationary Case

When stationarity is relaxed a more refined treatment needs to be carried out. The basic idea is to subdivide the partial sum $S_{[k,k+n)} = \sum_{j=k}^{k+n-1} X_j$ into blocks

$$S_{[k,k+l_n)},\ S_{[k+l_n,k+2l_n)},\ \ldots,\ S_{[k+(m_n-1)l_n,k+m_nl_n)},\ S_{[k+m_nl_n,k+n)} \tag{11}$$

where the first $m_n = [n/l_n]$ (the largest integer contained in) blocks have size l_n. Note that the last sum in (11): $S_{[k+m_nl_n,k+n)}$, have at most $n - m_nl_n$ terms, which is non-trivial in case l_n is not a divisor of n. As will be shown, by suitably choosing l_n (see (18)) and by assuming boundness conditions on Cox-Grimmet coefficient (8), the blocks can be made asymptotically independent. The following arguments suggest the required conditions. Let

$$\sigma^2_{[k,k+n)} = \mathrm{var}\{S_{[k,k+n)}\} \quad \text{and} \quad s^2_{m_n} = \sum_{j=1}^{m_n} \mathrm{var}\{S_{[k+(j-1)l_n,k+jl_n)}\}.$$

From positive associativity we have $\mathrm{cov}(X_r, X_s) \geqslant 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{cov}\big(S_{[k,k+l_n)}, \sum_{1<s\leqslant m_n} S_{[k+(s-1)l_n,k+sl_n)}\big) &= \sum_{k\leqslant r<k+l_n} \sum_{k+l_n<s\leqslant m_n} \mathrm{cov}\big(X_r, X_s\big) \\ &\leqslant \sum_{k\leqslant r<k+l_n} \sum_{|s-r|\geqslant k+l_n-r} \mathrm{cov}\big(X_r, X_s\big) \\ &= \sum_{k\leqslant r<k+l_n} u_r(k+l_n-r).\end{aligned}$$

The non-stationarity can be bypassed if $u_r(\cdot)$ can be bounded by a stationary sequence $v : \mathbb{Z}^+ \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $u_r(\cdot) \leqslant v(\cdot)$. In this case, the same arguments show that for $r < s$

$$\mathrm{cov}\big(S_{[k+(r-1)l_n,k+rl_n)}, \sum_{r<s\leqslant m_n} S_{[k+(s-1)l_n,k+sl_n)}\big) \leqslant \sum_{j=1}^{l_n} v(j)$$

and

$$\sum_{k\leqslant r\neq s<k+l_n} \mathrm{cov}\big(S_{[k+(r-1)l_n,k+rl_n)}, S_{[k+(s-1)l_n,k+sl_n)}\big) \leqslant 2m_n \sum_{j=1}^{l_n} v(j). \tag{12}$$

It follows that,

$$s^2_{m_n} \leqslant \sigma^2_{[k,k+m_nl_n)} \leqslant s^2_{m_n} + 2m_n \sum_{j=1}^{l_n} v(j). \tag{13}$$

Note that $\sigma^2_{[k,k+m_nl_n)} = \mathrm{var}\big\{\sum_{j=1}^{m_n} S_{[k+(j-1)l_n,k+jl_n)}\big\}$. Thus, we get "nearly independence" $\sigma^2_{[k,k+m_nl_n)} \approx s^2_{m_n}$ provided the last term can be properly controlled. This leads to:

Hypothesis 1. *Let* $\boldsymbol{X}$ *be a positive associated process satisfying :*

(a) there exists a constant $c > 0$ *such that* $\mathrm{var}\{X_j\} > c$*;*

(b) there exists a function $v : \mathbb{Z}^+ \to \mathbb{R}$ *such that*

$$\sum_{n\geqslant 0} v(n) < \infty \quad \textit{and} \quad u_j(n) \leqslant v(n), \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{Z}\,, \forall n \geqslant 0. \tag{14}$$

Remark 1. *For the stationary case condition (a) is a necessary assumption, or else, all the variables would be constants. A weaker condition*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=k}^{k+n}\mathrm{var}\{X_j\}>c,\quad \forall k\in\mathbb{Z}$$

could have been assumed. Also, condition (b) could have been replaced by : $\sum_{n\geqslant 0}u_j(n)<\infty$ *uniformly on* $j\in\mathbb{Z}$.

Lemma 3. *Assume that Hypothesis 1 holds. Then for* $k_1<k_2$,

$$(k_2-k_1)c\leqslant\sigma^2_{[k_1,k_2)}\leqslant(k_2-k_1)v(0)\quad \textit{and}\quad m_nl_nc\leqslant s^2_{m_n}\leqslant m_nl_nv(0). \tag{15}$$

Moreover, if $l_n\overset{n}{\to}\infty$ *and* $\dfrac{n}{l_n}\overset{n}{\to}\infty$ *then*

$$\frac{\sigma^2_{[k,k+n)}}{\sigma^2_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}}\overset{n}{\to}1\quad \textit{and}\quad \frac{\sigma^2_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}}{s^2_{m_n}}\overset{n}{\to}1. \tag{16}$$

Proof. (i) Note that, from the positivity of the covariances we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma^2_{[k_1,k_2)}&=\sum_{k_1\leqslant r,s<k_2}\mathrm{cov}(X_r,X_s)\\&\leqslant\sum_{r=k_1}^{k_2-1}\sum_{s\in\mathbb{Z}:|r-s|\geqslant 0}\mathrm{cov}(X_r,X_s)\leqslant(k_2-k_1)v(0).\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma^2_{[k_1,k_2)}&=\sum_{r=k_1}^{k_2-1}\mathrm{var}\{X_r\}+\sum_{k_1\leqslant r\neq s<k_2}\mathrm{cov}(X_r,X_s)\\&\geqslant(k_2-k_1)c.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that for $j=1,\cdots,m_n$ we have,

$$l_nc\leqslant\sigma^2_{[k+(j-1)l_n,k+jl_n)}\leqslant l_nv(0)$$

and

$$m_nl_nc\leqslant s^2_{m_n}=\sum_{j=1}^{m_n}\sigma^2_{[k+(j-1)l_n,k+jl_n)}\leqslant m_nl_nv(0).$$

(ii) The positive association also assures that

$$s^2_{m_n}\leqslant\sigma^2_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}\leqslant\sigma^2_{[k,k+n)}$$

and

$$\sigma^2_{[k,k+n)}\leqslant\sigma^2_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}+\sigma^2_{[k+m_nl_n,k+n)}.$$

From (15) we have $\dfrac{\sigma^2_{[k+m_nl_n,k+n)}}{\sigma^2_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}} \leqslant \dfrac{(n-m_nl_n)v(0)}{m_nl_nc}$. Since $\dfrac{n}{m_nl_n} \overset{n}{\to} 1$ we get

$$1 \leqslant \frac{\sigma^2_{[k,k+n)}}{\sigma^2_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}} \leqslant 1 + \frac{(n-m_nl_n)v(0)}{m_nl_nc} \overset{n}{\to} 1.$$

Similarly, from (13) and (14) we have

$$1 \leqslant \frac{\sigma^2_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}}{s^2_{m_n}} \leqslant 1 + 2\frac{m_n\sum_{j=1}^{l_n} v(j)}{m_nl_nc} \overset{n}{\to} 1.$$

□

To handle the weak convergence in the non-stationary setup we will make use of the Berry-Esseen inequality (cf. Feller, vol II, [10] : if $\xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots$ are zero-mean and independent r.v.'s such that $\mathbb{E}\{|\xi_j|^3\} < +\infty$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots$. Then

$$\sup_x \left| \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j}{\sqrt{\mathrm{var}\{\sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j\}}} \leqslant x \right) - \Phi(x) \right| \leqslant 6 \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}(|\xi_j|^3)}{\left(\sum_{j=1}^n \mathrm{var}(\xi_j)\right)^{3/2}}. \tag{17}$$

This will require a restrictier choice of the block size l_n,

$$l_n \overset{n}{\to} \infty, \quad \frac{n}{l_n} \overset{n}{\to} \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{l_n^3}{m_n} \overset{n}{\to} 0. \tag{18}$$

Just take, for example, $l_n = n^\delta$ with $\delta < 1/4$.

Theorem 6. *Assume* $\boldsymbol{X}$ *satisfies Hypothesis 1 and that for some constant* C_* *we have* $\mathbb{E}\{|X_j|^3\} < C_* < +\infty$ *for all* $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. *Then for* $0 < r \leqslant 2$ *we have*

$$d_r\big(F_{[k,k+n)}, \Phi\big) \overset{n}{\to} 0, \quad F_{[k,k+n)} \overset{d}{=} \frac{S_{[k,k+n)} - \mathbb{E}\big(S_{[k,k+n)}\big)}{\sigma_{[k,k+n)}} \quad \textit{and} \quad \Phi \overset{d}{=} \mathrm{N}(0,1). \tag{19}$$

Proof. (i) Without loss of generality we may assume $\mathbb{E}\{X_j\} = 0$ for all j. If not, let $X'_j = X_j - \mathbb{E}\{X_j\}$ then the process $\{X'_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ satisfies the same hypotheses. Consider the blocks (11) and assume that the block size l_n satisfies (18). We will show that

$$d_2\big(F_{m_n}, \Phi\big) \overset{n}{\to} 0 \quad \text{with} \quad F_{m_n} \overset{d}{=} \frac{S_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}}{s_{m_n}}. \tag{20}$$

Assuming (20) holds then, by Theorem 2, there exists $Z^* \overset{d}{=} \Phi$ such that

$$d_2^2\big(F_{m_n}, \Phi\big) = \mathbb{E}\big\{\big(\frac{S_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}}{s_{m_n}} - Z^*\big)^2\big\}.$$

From the definition of Mallows distance (3) we have

$$d_2^2\big(F_{[k,k+n)},\Phi\big)\leqslant \mathbb{E}\big\{\big(\frac{S_{[k,k+n)}}{\sigma_{[k,k+n)}}-Z^*\big)^2\big\}.$$

Using Minkowski's inequality we have $d_2\big(F_{[k,k+n)},\Phi\big)\overset{n}{\to}0$ provided

$$A_n=\mathbb{E}\big\{\big(\frac{S_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}}{\sigma_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}}-\frac{S_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}}{s_{m_n}}\big)^2\big\}\overset{n}{\to}0 \tag{21}$$

and

$$B_n=\mathbb{E}\big\{\big(\frac{S_{[k,k+n)}}{\sigma_{[k,k+n)}}-\frac{S_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}}{\sigma_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}}\big)^2\big\}\overset{n}{\to}0. \tag{22}$$

As in the proof of Theorem 4, the Liapounov's inequality completes the proof for $0<r<2$.

(ii) To show (21) note that $\mathbb{E}\big\{\big(\frac{S_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}}{\sigma_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}}\big)^2\big\}=1$. By (16) we have

$$A_n=\mathbb{E}\big\{\big(\frac{S_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}}{\sigma_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}}\big)^2\big(1-\frac{\sigma_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}}{s_{m_n}}\big)^2\big\}=\big(1-\frac{\sigma_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}}{s_{m_n}}\big)^2\overset{n}{\to}0.$$

For (22) write $S_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}=S_{[k,k+n)}-S_{[k+m_nl_n,k+n)}$. Same arguments as above shows that,

$$\mathbb{E}\big\{\big(\frac{S_{[k,k+n)}}{\sigma_{[k,k+n)}}-\frac{S_{[k,k+n)}}{\sigma_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}}\big)^2\big\}\overset{n}{\to}0.$$

Since $\dfrac{n}{m_nl_n}\overset{n}{\to}1$ we have by (15)

$$\mathbb{E}\big\{\big(\frac{S_{[k+m_nl_n,k+n)}}{\sigma_{[k,k+m_nl_n)}}\big)^2\big\}\leqslant\frac{(n-m_nl_n)v(0)}{m_nl_nc}\overset{n}{\to}0.$$

And $B_n\overset{n}{\to}0$.

(iii) Since $\mathbb{E}\{|X_j|^3\}<C_*<+\infty$ the results from Lemma 1 can be applied. Taking $r_1=\cdots=r_{m_n}=\dfrac{t}{s_{m_n}}$ we get

$$\left|\mathbb{E}\big(\exp\big\{i\frac{t}{s_{m_n}}\sum_{j=1}^{m_n}S_{[k+(j-1)l_n,k+jl_n)}\big\}\big)-\prod_{j=1}^{m_n}\mathbb{E}\big(\exp\big\{i\frac{t}{s_{m_n}}S_{[k+(j-1)l_n,k+jl_n)}\big\}\big)\right|\leqslant A(t,k,m_n)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}A(t,k,m_n)&=\frac{t^2}{2s_{m_n}^2}\sum_{1\leqslant r\neq s\leqslant m_n}\operatorname{cov}\big(S_{[k+(r-1)l_n,k+rl_n)},S_{[k+(s-1)l_n,k+sl_n)}\big)\\&=\frac{t^2}{s_{m_n}^2}\sum_{r=1}^{m_n}\operatorname{cov}\big(S_{[k+(r-1)l_n,k+rl_n)},\sum_{r<s\leqslant m_n}S_{[k+(s-1)l_n,k+sl_n)}\big)\\&\leqslant\frac{t^2}{s_{m_n}^2}m_n\sum_{j=1}^{l_n}v(j)\leqslant\frac{t^2m_n}{m_nl_nc}\sum_{j=1}^{l_n}v(j)\overset{n}{\to}0.\end{aligned}$$

For the last inequalities we have used (12), (14) and (15). Now let $Y_j \stackrel{d}{=} S_{[k+(j-1)l_n,k+jl_n)}$ for $j = 1, \cdots, m_n$. Assume that $Y_1, \cdots, Y_{m_n}$ are independent r.v.'s. Then we can write.

$$\left| \mathbb{E}\big(\exp\big\{ i\frac{t}{s_{m_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{m_n} S_{[k+(j-1)l_n,k+jl_n)} \big\}\big) - \prod_{j=1}^{m_n} \mathbb{E}\big(\exp\big\{ i\frac{t}{s_{m_n}} Y_j \big\}\big) \right| \stackrel{}{\underset{n}{\to}} 0. \tag{23}$$

(iv) By (23) we have for $Z \stackrel{d}{=} \Phi$,

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m_n} Y_j}{s_{m_n}} \stackrel{d}{\to} Z \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \frac{S_{[k,k+m_n l_n)}}{s_{m_n}} \stackrel{d}{\to} Z. \tag{24}$$

And this will be accomplished using the Berrey-Esseen inequality (17). For every fixed n we have by Minkowski's inequality

$$\big[\mathbb{E}\big\{ |S_{[k+(j-1)l_n,k+jl_n)}|^3 \big\}\big]^{1/3} \leqslant \sum_{r=1}^{l_n-1} \big[\mathbb{E}\big\{ |X_r|^3 \big\}\big]^{1/3} \leqslant l_n C_*^{1/3}.$$

Thus, we have $\mathbb{E}\{|Y_j|^3\} = \mathbb{E}\{|S_{[k+(j-1)l_n,k+jl_n)}|^3\} \leqslant l_n^3 C_* < +\infty$ for every fixed n. Since the $Y_j's$ are independent we have $\mathrm{var}\{\sum_{j=1}^{m_n} Y_j\} = s_{m_n}^2$. From (17) we have

$$\sup_x \left| \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m_n} Y_j}{s_{m_n}} \leqslant x \right) - \Phi(x) \right| \leqslant 6 \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m_n} \mathbb{E}(|Y_j|^3)}{s_{m_n}^3}.$$

By (15) we have $s_{m_n}^3 \geqslant (m_n l_n c)^{3/2}$ and

$$\sup_x \left| \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m_n} (Y_j)}{s_{m_n}} \leqslant x \right) - \Phi(x) \right| \leqslant 6 \frac{m_n l_n^3 C_*}{(m_n l_n c)^{3/2}} \stackrel{}{\underset{n}{\to}} 0.$$

In the last limit we have used the fact that $\dfrac{l_n^3}{m_n} \stackrel{}{\underset{n}{\to}} 0$.

(v) To complete the proof of (20) we make use of Theorem 1. Note that $\dfrac{S_{[k,k+m_n l_n)}}{s_{m_n}} \in \mathcal{L}_2$ and by (16) we have

$$\mathbb{E}\big\{ \big(\frac{S_{[k,k+m_n l_n)}}{s_{m_n}}\big)^2 \big\} = \frac{\sigma^2_{k,k+m_n l_n)}}{s^2_{m_n}} \stackrel{}{\underset{n}{\to}} 1 = \mathbb{E}\{Z^2\}.$$

From (24) we also have $\dfrac{S_{[k,k+m_n l_n)}}{s_{m_n}} \stackrel{d}{\to} Z$. And (20) follows. □

5 Applications to Gibbsian Dependent Ensembles

We will be considering processes $\boldsymbol{X} \equiv \{X_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ defined on $\Omega = E^{\mathbb{Z}}$ where $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable subset. Let $\mathcal{B}(E)$ denote the Borel subsets and let λ be a probability measure on $(E, \mathcal{B}(E))$. On the product space Ω let $\mathscr{F}$ denote the usual σ-field. Assume that the variables X_n are projections, that is, for $\omega = (\cdots, \omega_{-1}, \omega_0, \omega_1, \cdots) \in \Omega$ we have $X_n = \omega_n$. The probabilities of the ensembles ω will be derived from a given specifications $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \{\gamma_\Lambda(A|\omega) : A \in \mathscr{F}, \omega \in \Omega, \Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}, \Lambda \text{ finite}\}$ formed by a suitalbe family of probability kernels. The kernels $\{\gamma_\Lambda(\cdot|\cdot)\}_{\Lambda\subset\mathbb{Z}}$ are candidates for conditional expectations. Define $\mathscr{F}_\Lambda \equiv \sigma(X_i : i \in \Lambda)$ and similarly $\mathscr{F}_{\mathbb{Z}\setminus\Lambda}$. Gibbs measures $\mathscr{G}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$ are defined to be all the probability measures μ on $(\Omega, \mathscr{F})$ for which $\mathbb{E}_\mu(\mathbb{1}_A|\mathscr{F}_{\mathbb{Z}\setminus\Lambda})(\omega) = \gamma_\Lambda(A|\omega)$, μ-a.s..

In the examples that follow the specification $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ will be given by exponentially decaying probabilities generated by a prescribed Hamiltonian H. Let $\boldsymbol{J} = \{J_{ij} \geqslant 0 : i, j \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be a collection of real numbers such that

$$J_{ii} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} J_{ij} < +\infty.$$

For each finite $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$ define

$$H_\Lambda(\omega) = \sum_{i,j\in\Lambda} J_{ij}\ \omega_i\omega_j + \sum_{i\in\Lambda, j\in\mathbb{Z}\setminus\Lambda} J_{ij}\ \omega_i\omega_j.$$

Under the above setting, if for all finite $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$ we have

$$Z_\Lambda(\omega) = \int_{E^{|\Lambda|}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma_j=\omega_j:\forall j\in\mathbb{Z}\setminus\Lambda\}}(\sigma) \exp(H_\Lambda(\sigma)) \prod_{i\in\Lambda} d\lambda(\sigma_i) < +\infty.$$

Then for all $A \in \mathscr{F}$, $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}$ finite and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\gamma_\Lambda(A, \omega) = \frac{1}{Z_\Lambda(\omega)} \int_{E^{|\Lambda|}} \mathbb{1}_A(\sigma)\mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma_j=\omega_j:\forall j\in\mathbb{Z}\setminus\Lambda\}}(\sigma)\ \exp(H_\Lambda(\sigma))\ \prod_{i\in\Lambda} d\lambda(\sigma_i)$$

define a specification. For further details on this matter see Georgii [13].

We are interested on the pair λ and $\boldsymbol{J}$ that ensure the existence of at least one Gibbs measure $\mu \in \mathscr{G}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$. And such that the CLT holds for $\boldsymbol{X}$ on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mu)$. More specifically, for $S_{[k,k+n)} = \sum_{i=k}^{k+n-1} X_i$

$$\left| \mu\left(\frac{S_{[k,k+n)} - \mathbb{E}_\mu(S_{[k,k+n)})}{\sqrt{\mathrm{var}_\mu(S_{[k,k+n)})}} \leqslant x \right) - \Phi(x) \right| \underset{n}{\to} 0. \tag{25}$$

And a stronger result, namely, the convergence in the Mallows distance

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} d_r(F^\mu_{S_{[k,k+n)}}, \Phi) = 0 \quad \text{with } F^\mu_{S_{[k,k+n)}} \overset{\mathrm{d}}{=} \frac{S_{[k,k+n)} - \mathbb{E}_\mu(S_{[k,k+n)})}{\sqrt{\mathrm{var}_\mu(S_{[k,k+n)})}}. \tag{26}$$

Example 1. *Suppose that $E = \mathbb{R}$ and let λ be a non-degenerated probability measure on $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} x^2 d\lambda(x) < +\infty$. Assume that $J_{ij} = 0$ for all i and $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $Z_\Lambda(\omega) = 1$ and $\gamma_\Lambda(\cdot,\cdot)$ are well-defined. The set of the Gibbs measures $\mathscr{G}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$ is a singleton and its unique probability measure μ is the product measure $\mu = \prod_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \lambda_i$ where $\lambda_i = \lambda$, $\forall i \in \mathbb{Z}$. This is easily verified by noting that for $B \in \mathscr{F}_{\mathbb{Z}\setminus\Lambda}$ and $A \in \mathscr{F}$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\int_B \mathbb{1}_A(\omega) d\mu(\omega) &= \int_B \Big[\int_{\mathbb{R}^{|\Lambda|}} \mathbb{1}_A(\sigma) \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma_j = \omega_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}\setminus\Lambda\}}(\sigma) \prod_{i\in\Lambda} d\lambda_i(\sigma_i) \Big] \prod_{j\in\mathbb{Z}\setminus\Lambda} d\lambda_j(\omega_j) \\ &= \int_B \gamma_\Lambda(A,\omega) \prod_{j\in\mathbb{Z}\setminus\Lambda} d\lambda_j(\omega_j) = \int_B \gamma_\Lambda(A,\omega) d\mu(\omega).\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\mathbb{E}_\mu(\mathbb{1}_A | \mathscr{F}_{\mathbb{Z}\setminus\Lambda})(\omega) = \gamma_\Lambda(A|\omega)$. It follows that we have a sequence of i.i.d r.v.'s with $X_i \overset{\mathrm{d}}{=} \lambda$. Since λ is non-degenerated we have $\mathrm{var}\{X_i\} > 0$. Clearly the hypotheses of Theorem 4 are satisfied and the desired convergences (25) and (26) follow for $r \leq 2$. Moreover, if for some $r^* > 2$ we have $\int_{\mathbb{R}} |x|^{r^*} d\lambda(x) < +\infty$ then by Theorem 5 we also have (26) for $2 < r < r^*$.

Example 2. *Let $E = [-1, 1]$ and let λ be the normalized Lebesgue measure on E. For fixed $L > 0$ define $\boldsymbol{J}$ by :*

$$J_{ij} = J \mathbb{1}_{\{0<|i-j|\leqslant L\}}, \quad i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$$

where $J > 0$ is a constant. In this case, it is well-known that set of the Gibbs measures $\mathscr{G}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \{\mu\}$ is a singleton. A straightforward application of the GKS-II inequality shows that $\boldsymbol{X}$ on $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mu)$ is not a sequence of independent r.v.'s. Making use of the FKG inequality one can verify that $\boldsymbol{X}$ on $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mu)$ is stationary and positive associated. The Lieb-Simon inequality (cf. [19] and [24]) shows that the susceptibility $\chi(\mu) < +\infty$. Thus (4) holds and we have from Theorem 4 the convergences (25) and (26) for $0 < r \leqslant 2$. Moreover, the Lieb-Simon inequality also assures that for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $\mathrm{cov}_\mu(X_0, X_i) \leq Ce^{-m|i|}$, where C and m are positive constants. It follows that the hypotheses of Theorem 5 are verified and the convergence (26) also holds for $r \geqslant 2$.

Example 3. *Let $E = \{-1, 1\}$, λ the normalized counting measure on E. For all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ we define $J_{ii} = 0$ and*

$$J_{ij} = \beta |i - j|^{-\alpha}, \quad i, j \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } i \neq j$$

where $\beta > 0$ and $\alpha > 1$.

In this example the discussion is much more subtle. We have to split the analysis in terms of the parameter α in two cases[1]. The first one (and more complex) is $1 < \alpha \leqslant 2$

[1]For $\alpha < 1$ the collection $\boldsymbol{J}$ is not even λ-admissible so this case is in some sense is considered trivial.

and the second is $\alpha > 2$. To make it explicit the dependence on the parameters β and α, we write $\mathscr{G}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\beta,\alpha})$ instead of $\mathscr{G}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$.

Suppose that $1 < \alpha \leqslant 2$. In this case there is a real number $\beta_c(\alpha)$, called critical point satisfying $0 < \beta_c(\alpha) < +\infty$, such that the set of the Gibbs measures $\mathscr{G}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\beta,\alpha})$ has infinitely many elements for all $\beta > \beta_c(\alpha)$ (supercritical phase) and for all $\beta < \beta_c(\alpha)$ is a singleton (subcritical phase) [9, 12]. In the subcritical phase, the unique probability measure $\mu_{\beta,\alpha}$ compatible with the specification $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\beta,\alpha}$ has the FKG property and the stochastic process $\boldsymbol{X} = \{X_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ on $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mu_{\beta,\alpha})$ is associated and stationary. Aizenman and Newman [1] obtained polynomial decay for $\mathrm{cov}_{\mu_{\beta,\alpha}}(X_0, X_i)$, up to the critical point , i.e., the existence of some positive constant $C(\beta,\alpha)$ so that for all $\beta < \beta_c(\alpha)$ we have $\mathrm{cov}_{\mu_{\beta,\alpha}}(X_0, X_i) \leq C(\beta,\alpha)|i|^{-\alpha}$ and therefore (since $\alpha > 1$) the susceptibility $\chi(\mu_{\beta,\alpha}) < +\infty$ and the Cox-Grimmett coefficient satisfies $u_{\boldsymbol{X}}(n) = O(n^{1-\alpha})$. In this case the convergence (26) *holds for $r = 2$ or $r > 2$ and $r^2 + (\delta - 2)r < 2\delta\alpha$ for some $\delta > 0$ (Lemma 2).*

For $1 < \alpha \leqslant 2$ and $\beta_c(\alpha) < \beta$ the analysis is much harder. For example, we can not ensure that the stochastic process $\boldsymbol{X}$ on $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mu)$ is stationary for any $\mu \in \mathscr{G}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\beta,\alpha})$. Moreover the susceptibility is not finite anymore.

The case $\alpha > 2$ is similar to the case $1 < \alpha \leq 2$ and $\beta < \beta_c(\alpha)$, but no restriction on the parameter β is need to ensure the uniqueness of the Gibbs measures and the other used properties.

On each of the three previous examples, the stochastic process $\boldsymbol{X}$ on $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mu)$ is stationary. We now present a new example where the stationarity hypothesis is broken and the more general results of the Section 4 is required to ensure the convergence (26). We remark that for the next example the CLT theorem obtained by Newman in [21] can not used.

Example 4. *We take $E = \{-1, 1\}$, λ the normalized counting measure on E. For all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ we define $J_{ii} = 0$ and*

$$J_{ij} = |i - j|^{-\alpha} + r_{ij}, \quad i, j \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } i \neq j$$

where $\alpha > 2$ and r_{ij} is arbitrarily chosen, but satisfying for some positive constants $C_1 < 1$ and $C_2 > 1$ the following inequalities $C_1|i-j|^{-\alpha} \leqslant r_{ij} \leqslant C_2|i-j|^{-\alpha}$. The family $\boldsymbol{J}$ is λ-admissible and the set of the Gibbs measures $\mathscr{G}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$ still is a singleton. This unique Gibbs measure μ has the FKG property and $\boldsymbol{X}$ on $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mu)$ is not stationary, in general.

Note that the Hipothesis 1 of the Section 4 follows from the GKS-II [14, 16] and Simon-Lieb [19] inequalities. Since the coordinates of $\boldsymbol{X}$ are uniformly bounded, we can apply Theorem 6 to obtain the convergence (26).

Acknowledgements

The authors are partially supported by CNPq.

References

[1] M. Aizenman, and C. M. Newman. *Discontinuity of the percolation density in one-dimensional* $1/|x-y|^2$ *percolation models*. Communications in Mathematical Physics, v. 107, p. 611–647, **1986**.

[2] R. Barlow, and F. Proschan. *Statistical Theory of Reliability and Life Testing*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, **1975**.

[3] P. J. Bickel, and D. A. Freedman. *Some asymptotic theory for the Bootstrap*. Annals of Statistics, v. 9, p. 1196–1217, **1981**.

[4] P. Billingsley. *Convergence of Probability Measures*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, **1968**.

[5] T. Birkel. *Moment Bounds for Associated Sequences*. The Annals of Probability, v. 16, p. 1184–1193, **1988**.

[6] J. Cox, and G. Grimmett. *Central limit theorems for associated random variables and the percolation model*. The Annals of Probability, v. 12, p. 514–528, **1984**.

[7] C. C. Y. Dorea, and D. B. Ferreira. *Conditions for equivalence between Mallows distance and convergence to stable laws*. Acta Mathematica Hungarica, v. 134, p. 1–11, **2012**.

[8] C. C. Y. Dorea, and M. A. Oliveira. *The Donsker's theorem for Levy stable motions via Mallows distance*. Markov Processes and Related Fields, v. 20, p. 167–172, **2014**.

[9] J. F. Dyson. *Existence of a phase-transition in a one-dimensional Ising ferromagnet*. Communications in Mathematical Physics, v. 12, p. 91–107, **1969**.

[10] W. Feller. *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications, Vol. II*. Second Edition, John Wiley & Sons, New York, **1966**.

[11] C. M. Fortuin, P. W. Kasteleyn, and J. Ginibre. *Correlation inequalities on some partially ordered sets*. Communications in Mathematical Physics, v. 22, p. 89–103, **1971**.

[12] J. Fröhlich, and T. Spencer. *The phase transition in the one-dimensional Ising model with* $1/r^2$ *interaction energy*. Communications in Mathematical Physics, v. 84, p. 87–101, **1982**.

[13] H. O. Georgii, *Gibbs Measures and Phase Transitions*, Second Edition, De Gruyter, **2011**.

[14] R. B. Griffiths. *Correlations in ising ferromagnets. I*. Journal of Mathematical Physics, v. 8, p. 478–483, **1967**.

[15] T. E. Harris. *A lower bound for the critical probability in a certain percolation process*. Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society, v. 59, p. 13–20, **1960**

[16] D. G. Kelly, and S. Sherman. *General Griffhts Inequalities on Correlations in Ising Ferromagnets*. Journal of Mathematical Physics, v. 9, p. 466–484, **1969**.

[17] O. Johnson and R. Samworth *Central limit theorem and convergence to stable laws in Mallows distance*. Bernoulli, v. 11, 829-845, **2005**.

[18] J. Lebowitz. *Bounds on the correlations and analyticity properties of ferromagnetic Ising spin systems*. Communications in Mathematical Physics, v. 28, p. 313–321, **1972**.

[19] E. H. Lieb. *A refinement of Simon's correlation inequality*. Communications in Mathematical Physics, v. 77, p. 127–135, **1980**.

[20] C. L. Mallows. *A note on asymptotic joint normality*. The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, v. 43, p. 508–515, **1972**.

[21] C. M. Newman. *Normal fluctuations and the FKG Inequalities*. Communications in Mathematical Physics, v. 74, p. 119–128, **1980**.

[22] C. M. Newman and A. L. Wright. *An invariance principle for certain dependent sequences*. The Annals of Probability, v. 9, p. 671–675, **1981**.

[23] P. E. Oliveira. *Asymptotics for Associated Random Variables*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, **2012**.

[24] B. Simon. *Correlation inequalities and the decay of correlations in ferromagnets*. Communications in Mathematical Physics, v. 77, p. 111–126, **1980**.